REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 225 RE 000 038

EVALUATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT INSTITUTES FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN READING, 1965. FINAL REPORT.

BY- STAUFFER, RUSSELL G. AND OTHERS

INTERNATIONAL READING ASSN., NEWARK, DEL.

PUB DATE NOV 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$4.04 101P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EVALUATION, *EVALUATION TECHNIQUES, INTERVIEWS, READING IMPROVEMENT, READING MATERIALS, READING PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, TEACHER EVALUATION, FACULTY EVALUATION, NEWARK

AN EVALUATION OF 34 INSTITUTES UNDER THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT (NDEA) FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN READING WAS CONDUCTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION TO ELICIT INFORMATION IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS--(1) CONGRUENCE OF PROGRAM WITH DETAILS OF THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL, (2) EFFECTIVENESS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM CONTENT, (3) EFFICIENCY OF ADMINISTRATION, AND (4) APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PHYSICAL CONDITIONS. VISITING TEAMS CODUCTED INTERVIEWS WITH INSTITUTE DIRECTORS, STAFF MEMBERS, AND PARTICIPANTS WITH THE AID OF CHECKLISTS. SUMMARIES OF THE INTERVIEW FINDINGS AND THE GENERAL REACTIONS OF THE VISITING REGIONAL DIRECTORS ARE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE INSTITUTES CONCLUDE THE REPORT. THE MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAMS AND THE NDEA INSTITUTES FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN READING, 1965. THE NAMES OF THE EVALUATION PERSONNEL AND THE CHECKLIST ITEMS USED TO GUIDE THE INTERVIEWS ARE PROVIDED. (RH)

ED011225

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

EVALUATION
of
NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT
INSTITUTES FOR ADVANCED STUDY
IN
READING

by

THE INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION

TYRE AVENUE AT MAIN STREET

NEWARK, DELAWARE

RE000038

FINAL REPORT

Evaluation
of
National Defense Education Act
Institutes for Advanced Study
in Reading, 1965

by

The International Reading Association
Tyre Avenue at Main Street
Newark, Delaware

The evaluation reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (under the provisions of Public Law 81-152, Title III Section 302 (c) (10))

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of thirty-four 1965 NDEA Institutes for Advanced Study in Reading was conducted by the International Reading Association to elicit information in the following areas: 1) Congruence of program with details of the original proposal, 2) Effectiveness of the implementation of program content, 3) Efficiency of administration, 4) Appropriateness of the physical conditions.

Visiting teams conducted interviews with Institute Directors, staff members and participants with the aid of check-lists. Summaries of the interview findings are included in this report, as well as a summary of the general reactions of the visiting regional directors. Recommendations for future Institutes, based upon these findings, conclude the report.

Foreword

The best way to begin this foreword is to express gratitude to the many people who contributed to this report. The directors of the summer Reading Institutes cooperated throughout and did so most helpfully. Members of Mr. Bigelow's staff, particularly Loretta Wawrzyniak and Eugene Slaughter seemed to be on constant alert for our calls for guidance. The eight regional directors rendered yeoman service. It is from their reporting that this final report was prepared. Not only did they complete reports on each of the Institutes visited but also they served as advisors and editorial assistants in the preparation of this final statement. The other members of the visiting teams also gave of their busy time and talent. Special commendation is due the office staff at the International Reading Association's Headquarters. They could not have been more cooperative. And, of course, it must be kept in mind that a project such as this could not have been initiated in mid-June and accomplished by late October, in spite of busy schedules, without team effort in a leadership capacity. This final report represents the writing effort of three people. Ralph Staiger, Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the International Reading Association served as coordinator of the entire project and contributed much to the preparation of this final report. The project could not have been done without his help. James Kerfoot, in the role of associate director of the project played this role to the fullest. His relentless effort throughout the summer and particularly in the preparation of this report was most fruitful. To all, and especially the last two, I am most grateful.

Russell G. Stauffer
November, 1965

Table of Contents

Page

Problem 1
  Description of the Institute 3
  Objectives of the Evaluation 4

Procedures of the Evaluation 6
  The Washington Conference 6
  Evaluation Personnel 7
  The Philadelphia Meeting 9
  Reports 12
  Visitation 13
  Boulder Conference 13

Interviews with Directors and Staff Members 14
  Directors' Responses to Check-list Items 14
  Staff Responses to Check-list Items 37
  Summary: Directors and Staff 44

Interviews with Participants 56
  Responses to Check-list Items 56
  Summary: Participants 72

General Reactions of Regional Directors 77

Recommendations 82

Appendix A - Members of Visiting Teams 86

Appendix B - NDEA Institutes for Advanced
Study in Reading, 1965 89

PROBLEM

The need for more effective reading instruction has increased greatly in recent years. Demands for critical reading skills are greater today than ever before. Extensive reading has become the responsibility of every thoughtful citizen and intensive critical reading the prerequisite for success in a society of specialists. While skill in reading has become more important, surveys of teacher competence indicate that many children are not afforded the opportunities for reading growth possible with newer approaches and materials. The need to improve teacher effectiveness was recognized by the federal government through the provision for reading institutes in the National Defense Education Act as amended 1964.

The program provided under Title XI was approved for four fiscal years beginning with that ending June 30, 1965. The authorization is as follows:

TITLE XI - INSTITUTES
AUTHORIZATION OF INSTITUTES

Sec. 1101. There are authorized to be appropriated $32,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials, to improve the qualification of individuals—

(1) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching or supervising or training of teachers, of history, geography, modern foreign languages, reading, or English in elementary or secondary schools,

(2) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching of disadvantaged youth and are, by virtue of their service or future service in elementary or secondary schools enrolling substantial numbers of culturally, economically, socially, and educationally handicapped youth, in need of specialized training, except that no institute may be established under this title for teachers of disadvantaged youth unless such institute will offer a specialized program of instruction designed to assist such teachers in coping with the unique and peculiar problems involved in the teaching of such youth,

(3) who are engaged as, or preparing to engage as, library personnel in the elementary or secondary schools, or as supervisors of such personnel, or,

(4) who are engaged as, or are preparing to engage as, educational media specialists.

For the first year of the program fifty-three Reading Institutes were funded at a cost of over two and one-half million dollars. The programs for succeeding years were thought likely to obtain maximum effectiveness only if first year institutes were carefully evaluated. Strengths and weaknesses of various institute approaches were therefore to be clearly identified and made available to those planning future reading institutes, those reviewing proposals, and Office of Education personnel in responding to a variety of inquiries. To provide such an evaluation the International Reading Association, a professional organization, with its Headquarters located in Newark, Delaware, entered into a contract with the U.S. Office of Education under Public Law 88210.

Description of Institutes

President Johnson signed into law the National Defense Education Act Amendments authorizing Title XI on October 16, 1964. Institutes funded under those provisions for the summer of 1965 were classified under three code designations.

> Code I Institutes were designed for those individuals whose level of preparation approximated the Masters degree. Only one such Institute was approved.
>
> Code II Institutes were designed for those individuals with preparation beyond a basic course. Institutes of diverse type were funded under code 2. These included Institutes for teaching of the deaf, for remedial reading, for supervisors of student teachers, and for teachers of the disadvantaged.
>
> Code III Institutes were designed for those individuals who had no more than one course in reading. The great majority of approved Institutes were of this type.

A total of fifty-three Reading Institutes were approved for 1965. This included:

Code I - One Institute for Reading supervision

Codes I and II - One Institute on the organization and operation of reading centers

Code II - Five Institutes: Three of these emphasized remedial reading, one featured linguistics in reading instruction, and one was concerned with the supervision of student teachers.

Codes II and III - Seven Institutes were held in which a component of special emphasis supplemented general reading instruction. Areas of special emphasis were remedial reading, disadvantaged youth and deaf children.

Code III - Thirty-nine Institutes were concerned primarily with general reading instruction.

Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation was undertaken to determine answers to the following general questions:

1. How appropriate were the general Institute aims and objectives?
2. What were the most effective Institute sizes?
3. What were the most effective Institute schedules?
4. What backgrounds and time involvements were most appropriate for Institute directors and staff members?
5. What were the most important factors in administrative efficiency?
6. What were the most effective participant selection procedures?
7. How congruent were Institute plans and programs?
8. How effective were materials and newer media in the Institute programs?
9. What approaches made the greatest contributions to the Institute programs?
10. How were the various Institute components most efficiently coordinated?

11. What measurement techniques were most useful?

12. What physical arrangements were most appropriate to accomplish Institute objectives?

13. What were the most useful follow-up procedures?

14. What were the most valuable aspects of the Institutes?

15. What were the chief problems encountered with the Institutes?

16. How effectively did the Reading Institutes meet major needs in reading instruction?

The evaluation was concerned with both general recommendations and recommendations relating to the unique circumstances of individual Institutes. Institutes were evaluated to obtain detailed information on individual programs and to develop consensus recommendations when response patterns were evident. Because Institute settings differed appreciably, interpretation of the general recommendations must be done with caution to avoid stereotyped Institute proposals

PROCEDURES OF THE EVALUATION

The Washington Conference

Negotiations between the International Reading Association and the U.S. Office of Education for the evaluation of Reading Institutes were initiated in June, 1965. At that time the project directors were selected and a conference with U.S. Office of Education representatives was planned. Ralph Staiger, Executive Secretary of the International Reading Association agreed to serve as Evaluation Coordinator and assumed leadership during contract negotiations.

Russell Stauffer, Director of the Reading-Study Center at the University of Delaware and Editor of The Reading Teacher was selected as the General Director of the Evaluation. James Kerfoot, Director of the Reading Center at the Wisconsin State University at River Falls, and General Chairman of I.R.A. Convention Institutes, was selected as Associate Director.

A conference was subsequently held on June 15th in Washington D.C. at which the Director, Associate Director, and Coordinator consulted with Office of Education officials. At that time the objectives of evaluation were clarified and a plan of evaluation was developed. The location of each of the fifty-three Institutes was plotted on a large map of the

United States and large regional clusters were identified. This gross grouping was done so that the evaluation might be accomplished on a regional basis. Next it was decided that at best approximately two-thirds of the Institutes might be evaluated on a visiting team basis. Accordingly, Thirty-four Institutes were selected in such a way that the sample would be representative of the different code designations and the areas of special emphasis under the code plan.

Eight Regional Directors were selected on the basis of their experience, knowledge and availability. Some had special proficiency in elementary or secondary reading; remedial reading; English; disadvantaged youth; bilingualism; administration. Two consultants were selected to advise in the development of survey techniques, data processing, and report evaluation.

The following is a list of the major contributors to the NDEA Reading Institute Evaluation.

Evaluation Personnel

Director:	Russell G. Stauffer Director, Reading Study Center University of Delaware Newark, Delaware
Associate Director:	James F. Kerfoot Director, Reading Center Wisconsin State University River Falls, Wisconsin

Coordinator:	Ralph C. Staiger Executive Secretary-Treasurer International Reading Association Newark, Delaware
North East Director:	Thomas Devine Professor of English Education Rhode Island College Providence, Rhode Island
South East Director:	John Simmons Professor of English Education Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida
South Central Director:	Albert J. Kingston Professor of Education University of Georgia Athens, Georgia
North Central Director	Thomas C. Barrett Associate Professor of Education University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin
Mid-West Director:	Nita Wyatt Associate Professor of Education University of Kansas Laurence, Kansas
South West Director:	Thomas Horn Professor of Education University of Texas Austin, Texas
Far West Director:	Millard Black Elementary Reading Supervisor Los Angeles Public Schools Los Angeles, California
Mid-Atlantic Director:	John Ames Director of Teacher Education Queens College Flushing, New York
Consultant for Survey:	Edward G. Summers Associate Professor of Education University of Indiana Bloomington, Indiana

Consultant for Survey:
Ruth Strang
Professor of Education
University of Arizona
~~Tempe~~, Arizona
Tucson

Consultant for Report Evaluation:
Theodore Clymer
Professor of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

The Philadelphia Conference

After the Washington Conference a plan of operation was prepared by Professors Staiger and Stauffer for the International Reading Association. This plan of operation for the Evaluation of the 1965 NDEA Institutes was submitted to Donald N. Bigelow, Head of Task Force for Institutes for Advanced Study. In the interim and until June 29, 1965 a letter contract was entered into so that work could be begun on the project effective June 15, 1965. A definitive contract was then negotiated with the contract period agreed upon from June 15, 1965 to October 31, 1965.

On June 25-27, a planning conference was held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. General and Regional Directors met at that time with representatives of the U.S. Office of Education to set goals, plan procedures, and develop check-lists to guide visiting evaluators. The following Agenda was prepared and used:

NDEA Reading Institute Evaluation Project

Regional Leaders' Meeting

Philadelphia, June 26-27, 1965

AGENDA

1. Purpose of the Institutes and Evaluation Project - Miss Loretta Wawrzyniak, Task Force, NDEA Institutes, U.S. Office of Education
2. 1965 Guidelines for the Preparation of Proposals - Ralph Staiger
3. Procedures for Visitations - Russell Stauffer
    a) Directors' Responsibilities to Observers
    b) Observers' Activities
    c) Reports
    d) Financial Consideration
4. Observation Check Lists - Russell Stauffer
    a) Discussion
    b) Group Discussion and Revision
    c) Final Version
5. Scheduling Visitations - James Kerfoot

Team members were charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Regional Director. The Regional Director will visit all Institutes selected for evaluation within his region. He will coordinate the activities of team members and arrange with Institute Directors for accomodations and travel for visiting evaluators. He will assume responsibility for scheduling visits to provide a thorough evaluation with a minimum disturbance of Institute routine.

2. College-Level Educator. This evaluator will be a college person selected by the Regional Director on each visit and will be selected to provide a balance of special proficiencies on the team. Both reading and English backgrounds should be well represented on each team. Activities of the Regular Evaluator during the visit will be specified by the Regional Director.

3. Local Evaluator. In addition to regular team members, a Local Evaluator will be selected for each Institute visited. The Local Evaluator should be a public school person who is familiar with the problems and needs of teachers in the area most directly served by the Institute. He will be responsible to the Regional Director who may schedule a visit by the local person on a separate day from that on which the Director and Regular Evaluator visit.

4. Associate Director. The Associate Director of the Institute Evaluation will schedule one visit as a team member in each of the eight regions. He will take an active part in each evaluation as specified by the Regional Director. The Associate Director will confer with the Regional Director during this visit and discuss with him the problems and progress of all evaluations within the region. He will make suggestions to Regional Directors to assure uniformity of evaluation among regional teams.

Consensus was reached at the Philadelphia Conference on general evaluation procedures. The following agreements were recorded and submitted by the General Director to the eight Regional Directors:

1. Visits
    a. The day of observation should be selected by you after you have studied an Institute's daily schedule.
    b. Select a day that provides opportunity for you to see a good sample of activities as described in the Institute's plan of procedure.
    c. Arrange to see the Institute Director the evening before visiting day, if at all possible.
        1. Have college-level evaluator and local evaluator present.
        2. Complete check-list for Administrators at this meeting.
        3. Review schedule.
    d. Avoid having all three evaluators (regional director, college person, local person) visiting on one day.
        1. Plan to visit the Institute on the same day the college observer visits.

        2. If you and the college person cannot visit on the same day, try to plan a visit in the company of the local evaluator.
        3. If neither (1) or (2) can be arranged, go alone.
        4. The associate director will try to visit one Institute in each region. You may be able to arrange one of your visits to coincide with his.

2. On Day of Observation
    a. Start the day early if possible, so that you may see the Institute day getting started.
    b. Allow time for doing check-list interviewing with participants.
    c. If you and a second person are visiting on the same day, two sets of participants could be interviewed simultaneously —
        1) set one by you
        2) set two by second person
    d. Limit a set of participants to nine (9) or less.

3. Check-List Interviews
    a. Use sound and acceptable interview practices. Avoid actions that may jeopardize respondent's participation.
    b. Complete and/or refine notes after the interview is finished.

Reports

A system of reports was developed incorporating the evaluations of the Regional Director, the College-Level Evaluator, the Local Evaluator, the Institute Director, the Institute Staff, and the Institute Participants. Extensive check-lists were drafted at the Philadelphia Conference and refined by the Director and the Associate Director to translate evaluation objectives into interview guide lines. Interview guides were developed for Directors, staff members, and participants. The interview reports of all team members were collated by the Regional Directors. Two reports were then submitted to the General Director by each Regional Director:

1. A collation report based on the check-list interviews.
2. An essay report giving the Evaluator's reactions to the Institute.

The reports from all Regional Directors were then collated and the finds of the Evaluation expressed as item and general summaries.

Visitation

In the months of July and August, visits were made to thirty-four Institutes. Some were visited in their first weeks of operation, some in the middle weeks, and others in the final weeks. This scheduling of visit strategy was dictated by the circumstances, but was not considered a liability.

Boulder Conference

A conference of all Reading Institute Directors was held in Boulder, Colorado on September 9-13. On September 9, the Director, Associate Director, Coordinator, Regional Directors and Consultants met to discuss the validity of the preliminary report. The fidelity of each summary item was carefully considered and verified. The Evaluators were unanimous in their endorsement of the preliminary report. The preliminary report was then presented orally to the fifty-four NDEA Reading Institute Directors assembled on September

12, 1965. The report was made in three parts and presented by the Director of the Evaluation, the Associate Director and the I.R.A. Coordinator. The report was then re-written to increase item precision and submitted once again to the eight Regional Directors for approval. Wholehearted approval was received. The final item summaries and general summaries are presented in the following sections of this report.

DIRECTORS' AND STAFF INTERVIEWS

Directors' Responses to Check-List Items

The Directors of the Institutes visited were interviewed by the visiting team of evaluators. The following check-list items were used to guide the interviews. The responses as recorded here represent several collations. First, the regional evaluator collated the notes of his team. These collations were then combined into a representative unified statement for each item by the Director, the Associate Director, and the Coordinator of this Survey. These collations were reviewed at the Boulder meeting by the Regional Directors to determine the degree to which these digest statements were acceptable. Revisions were then made and resubmitted in writing to the Regional Directors for their comments. From this resulted the digest statements as reported here for each item.

I. General Aims and Objectives

A. The primary objective of the Institute is to improve reading instruction. How well do you think this aim is being achieved? — The majority response to this question indicated that the program achieved its basic objectives very well and that classroom instruction would be improved. Success in improving instruction was judged high within the limits set by minimal experience backgrounds.

B. Which of the stated Institute objectives do you feel are being successfully accomplished? — Most of the Institute Directors had the general feeling that all of the objectives were being developed in some way. Many felt that through this program participants were assisted in recognizing, understanding, and coping with the complexities of the reading process, thereby being helped to develop a more effective program in reading.

C. Which of the stated Institute objectives do you feel are least adequately being achieved? — Some believed that the staff had underestimated the backgrounds in remedial reading of some of their participants. Because of this they felt that more advanced levels of diagnostic testing and remediation should have been provided initially. Others felt that the Institute should have provided more opportunity for developing those understandings and skills that are essential for diagnosis and remediation of the more common reading difficulties. Time limitations resulted in some objectives receiving only cursory attention, particularly those concerned with research.

D. What recommendations would you make on objectives for future Institutes? — Several Directors believed that the number of objectives should be reduced, and that Institutes should concentrate in depth upon a few. Many indicated that too wide a range of grade levels was included and that this range should be reduced.

II. Organization and Administration

A. Size of Institute

A.1. What was the orginial enrollment? — The original enrollment for the 34 Institutes evaluated totaled 1,372. The classes ranged from twenty to eighty with an average of forty participants.

A.2. What is the current enrollment and what has caused the change, if any? — The current enrollment for the thirty-four evaluated Institutes totaled 1,369, which meant that there were only three drop-outs. Illness was given as a reason for withdrawing.

A.3. What is your opinion about the size of the Institute? — The most common Institute size was forty participants. It was felt that this was a manageable number and that not many more could have been provided for adequately unless special provisions were made for additional staff and facilities.

A.4. What recommendations would you make on size for future Institutes? — Most Directors indicated that this should be based on the needs of the community, the size of the budget available, the number of staff and personnel, and the physical facilities. Several thought that if group size were thirty to forty, better communication could result and individual contact among the staff and participants might occur more readily.

B. Schedule

B.1. Length of term

B.1.a. What is the length of the Institute term? — Eleven of the thirty-four evaluated Institutes had eight-week sessions and nineteen had six-week sessions. One had only a four-week session and three held seven-week sessions.

B.1.b. What recommendations would you make on length of term for future Institutes? — Most Directors believed that six-week sessions would be optimal to give participants a sufficient amount of time for vacation and to coordinate with other summer schools in session. They suggested that Institute objectives could be accomplished satisfactorily in a six-week period.

B.2. Work Schedule

B.2.a. How many hours per week are scheduled for Institute activities for each participant? — The number of scheduled hours per week ranged from twenty to forty. However, the majority of the participants averaged between thirty to forty hours. This did not include the scheduled evening activities or the many unscheduled hours of work and study.

B.2.b. What recommendations would you make on scheduling work loads for future Institutes? — The majority of Directors thought that participants were very well satisfied with the schedule they were following. There was some feeling that they should be given more time for independent study, and that the group activities should not be scheduled so tightly. Thirty to forty-five hour per week schedules appeared to be an optimal recommendation.

B.3. Extra Curricular Activities

B.3.a. What extra curricular activities have been employed? — Many informally organized activities were scheduled. Some went on field trips and tours of the cities in which they were located. Picnics, baseball games, dances, and teas were included among extra curricular activities. Many of the Institutes culminated with a farewell dinner.

B.3.b. To what extent have they contributed to the success of the program? — It was felt that a wholesome and cooperative atmosphere was created by the extra activities and that they contributed to excellent relationships among the participants and with the staff. Directors could see a carry-over from field trips to Institute class work. The trips reportedly helped the participants to see the importance of such experience for concept building and vocabulary enrichment.

B.3.c. What recommendation would you make on extra curricular activities for future Institutes? — The majority believe that extra curricular activities were valuable and should be handled much as they were this year. It was suggested that the activities be planned by the Directors to fit into the schedule at times he considers appropriate. Some type of crafts and recreation program should be available for the children and dependents, and on occasion they should participate in affairs planned for the adult participants.

B.4. Relation of Institute to Fostering Institutions

B.4.a. Briefly describe the organizational pattern. — Organizational patterns varied but most often included a direct line of responsibility from the president to department head to Institute Director to instructional staff. Most Institutes were housed in a separate building and operating responsibility was given fully to the Director.

B.4.b. How much support does the Institute seem to be getting from the various administrative officers? — It was thought by the majority that the support from the administrative officers was excellent at all levels. Often extra help was offered and was given to them. There were some, however, who received very little help. Problems in procurement seemed most common. an extreme illustration is that of a requisition submitted to one of the business managers in May for materials which were needed for the first day of Institute. These had still not arrived at the time of evaluation. The flood of mail produced problems.

B.5. Director

B.5.a. What is your regular rank and special field? — Directors generally held high academic rank and were primarily reading specialists. Some Directors were not reading specialists, however, and were selected for their administrative talents. Those not reading specialists were predominantly language arts or curriculum specialists.

B.5.b. How were you selected? — In most cases the Dean of a college had asked an individual to write a proposal and assume leadership. The Deans chose these people primarily on the basis of experience and background in the field of reading. Only one Director had asked to head an Institute, and wrote the proposal largely because of his intense interest in the program.

B.5.c. What percentage of your time are you giving to the Institute? — It was reported that the majority of the Directors were giving 100% of their time to the Institute. Some gave 50% starting in February and 100% in the summer.

B.5.d. Do you feel that directing the Institute should be a full-time job? — The answer to this question was a strong "yes". It was felt also that the Director should be relieved of 50% of his responsibilities during Spring quarter so he could spend that time equipping the center, securing material, staff, etc., and handling the extensive communications.

B.5.e. What experience have you had in teaching reading? — "Directors" experience in teaching ranged from the elementary grade through college levels. Some taught reading methods to pre-service and in-service teachers. Others were involved as "adjustment teachers", teachers of remedial reading, teachers of culturally deprived children or instructors of college courses in efficient reading.

B.5.f. Do you think experience in teaching reading is essential to directing the Institute? — The majority of Directors believed that reading experience was a necessity, along with some administrative experience. It was felt that experience was especially important in the planning and evaluating stages. There were a few, however, who felt this was not so important because a Director had to assume so many administrative duties. His knowledge of reading was therefore thought to be of less importance if he had picked his staff well and had wise counsel available. It was further suggested that Directors who were reading experts should have greater instructional involvement and not devote full time to administration.

B.5.g. Who appointed the Institute staff? — The Director and the Assistant Director usually picked the staff, with the approval of the Dean and President. In one case the Associate Dean, rather than the Director, appointed the staff.

B.5.h. How much secretarial help is desirable? — Directors indicated that one full-time secretary was a definite need and that additional help should be made available as needed. They also thought that more help should be provided during the pre-institute period, particularly during the time for screening of participants.

B.5.i. Have you been given authority consonant with responsibility? — Full authority was given to almost all Directors. In a few cases other administrative officers, not responsible for the activities of the Institute assumed certain authority. One Director felt that he was not given adequate budget control.

B.6. Administrative Efficiency

B.6.a. How were staff members informed of the rules and procedures of the Institute? — Several Institutes held pre-institute planning sessions with the staff, and then a planning session during the weekend immediately preceding the Institute. Much use was also made of mail and telephone media.

B.6.b. How were participants informed of the rules and procedures of the Institute? — Many participants were informed of rules and procedures through individual interviews with Institute Directors. Brochures and schedules were forwarded by mail. Orientation sessions during the first days of an Institute were also held.

B.6.c. What recommendations would you make to improve the administrative efficiency of future Institutes? — Recommendations for improving administrative efficiency were few but included provisions for travel and/or expenses for pre-institute staff meetings. The attendance of participants at such meetings was viewed as a valuable possibility. Also, the information provided by the federal government should have contained somewhat better and more descriptive information on the Institute.

B.7. Staff

B.7.a. How extensive was the pre-institute staff briefing? — The most usual approach was a two-day conference preceding the Institute. Frequent correspondence also took place during the weeks before the Institute. In some programs as much as one week was allocated for orientation.

B.7.b. Was the briefing ample? — It was generally felt that the briefings were adequate and helped to reduce initial confusion. Some thought that more time and money should be provided for this purpose.

B.7.c. How frequent are staff discussions of Institute affairs? — The majority of the staff members met daily but at unscheduled times. These meetings were usually highly informal.

B.7.d. What recommendations would you make on staff meetings for future Institutes? — Most Directors thought that no changes were necessary and were very well satisfied. Some, however, felt that a schedule for formal sessions should be set up in advance and that a complete weekend might be utilized prior to the first day of the Institute.

B.8. Participants

B.8.a. Selection Procedures

B.8.a.1. How adequate were publicity procedures in bringing the Institute to the attention of potential participants and spelling out purposes and objectives? — Many inquiries and applications were received at each Institute. Directors felt that the brochures were not descriptive enough. If they had been more detailed and more explicit many unqualified people might not have applied and the administrative load might have been considerably lightened. Some Directors answered initial requests by sending a brochure and a specially-prepared description of the qualifications participants were expected to meet. This first mailing did not include an application form. Prospective participants were told to request application forms if they felt they met the criteria listed. In the instances in which this procedure was applied, this more critical self-selection reduced the number of applications and the number which needed to be rejected.

B.8.a.2. What were the means for selecting participants? — Many means were used to select participants. There was great variation to contend with in the level and amount of experience among applicants. They were required to write a statement giving purpose and interest as one basis of selection. Recommendations from superintendents and principals were also required. Other factors included telephone interviews, college transcripts, and plans for utilization and sharing of Institute experiences.

B.8.a.3. How many invitations to participants in the Institute were turned down? — Most of the participants accepted the invitations that were sent to them. Some received a number of invitations and then chose an Institute that was closer to their homes.

B.8.a.4. Was preference given to graduates of your institution? — No preference was given to graduates of host institutions.

B.8.a.5. Were participants of the type desired? — Most of the participants were judged to have had a real need for the basic kind of instruction which they had received. Most of the groups were highly enthusiastic and cooperative. Some Directors thought that the participants should have had better backgrounds and that ability levels were below that expected. These opinions were voiced even though forty-three of the Institutes were designed for individuals who had had, at most, only "one course in reading".

B.8.a.6. What is your general appraisal of the participants in terms of their reaction to the Institute and general enthusiasm? — The Directors judged that the majority of participants were very enthusuastic about the Institute and desired greatly to have follow-up Institutes of a similar nature. There was low morale at the outset in some Institutes and some negative feelings toward the amount of work expected. They later recognized the value in these experiences, and morale improved considerably as the Institute progressed.

B.8.a.7. What recommendations would you make on selection procedures for future Institutes? — Limiting participants' applications to regional or state areas would have facilitated follow-up programs. Some Directors felt the need for more information concerning emotional stability and health status. One Director wished for a guarantee that teachers from disadvantaged areas should comprise at least 25% of the total enrollment.

B.8.b. Selection Criteria

B.8.b.1. What were the announced criteria for selection? — Selection criteria varied greatly among Institutes but included in each case those limitations indicated by the code designation. Many Directors insisted on one or more letters of recommendation, an academic transcript, and a subjective statement of purpose from the applicant.

B.8.b.2. What recommendations would you make on selection criteria for future Institutes? — It was stated by many Directors that the present criteria were adequate and they made no suggestions for change. Others felt strongly that there should be only regional or state applications for their Institutes to aid follow-up efforts. Some believed that the criteria should be made as specific as possible to avoid difficult decisions at the time of selection. A strong recommendation for selection was an assurance that the participants would put their experiences to use in the classrooms and local in-service programs.

III. Programs and Practices

A. Congruence

A.1. Has the Institute specifically followed the plan of operation? — Generally speaking the Institutes followed the plan of operation specifically. Those few that did not made only minor modifications as problems arose.

A.2. What significant modifications have been made as the Institute has progressed? — Most of the modifications made in the schedule, more often than not, were for the purpose of allowing more time for individual study, but sometimes they were made to include more guest lectures and open discussions.

A.3. What are the reasons for modifications of the original plan? — The changes that had been made were done in view of the participants' needs. The fatigue element played a significant part - many participants complained of being overburdened. These changes were made only with the idea of improving the Institute program.

B. Materials

B.1. Are the materials which you are using adequate to the purpose of the Institute? — The response which appeared most frequently was "adequate". Other responses were usually a qualified "yes". Responses indicated that there was either too much or not enough material. When too much was reported it was said to be distracting. Generally more material would have been welcomed. Variety was considered important.

B.2. How have you supplemented the materials originally listed? — Some of the materials were purchased; however, most of them were acquired without expense. Much material came from commercial book exhibits via company representatives. Some of the materials were "trade books" borrowed from the college programming centers; some were brought from participants' own local school systems; and some were teacher and/or committee made materials.

B.3. What materials have you developed? — The most frequent response was that "each teacher developed materials according to his own needs". Four of the Directors answered "none"; three said that they had developed a sourcebook, handbook or booklets for all of the participants to use; and several indicated that they had developed extensive audio-visual materials.

B.4. What contributions have new or recently published materials made to your program? — Generally the Directors said that they were constantly receiving new commercial materials. The general consensus was that these materials made a great contribution. One Director mentioned that these recently published materials should be presented and evaluated by staff members. A course specifically designed to acquaint participants with new materials was developed in one Institute.

B.5. With what effectiveness have the newer media been incorporated in your programs? — Most of the responses to this question could be classified under the heading "very effectively". Three Directors indicated that the materials had been used with "some" effectiveness and eight indicated that they had been used with "little" effectiveness. One

Director felt that new media could be used most effectively with a remedial group. A few of the Institutes utilized classroom television, while many of the Institutes demonstrated the use of the new media.

B.6. What recommendations would you make on materials for future Institutes? — Several stated their desire for materials to be purchased through some budget provisions. A need was indicated for a reference or master list of new materials from which to choose and some assistance in choosing from the variety of materials and programs. Several indicated the need for larger materials centers and curriculum libraries.

C. Approaches

C.1. How effectively has instruction been meeting the needs of the participants (level, load, method)? — Nearly all the Directors considered the instruction to be meeting the participants' needs very effectively. A frequent comment described the load as "very demanding". Many indicated that the methods were varied and were devoted to demonstrations, discussions, individual counseling, independent study research, in addition to lectures.

C.2. How suited is the content of the Institute to the background and needs of participants? — Most of the Directors answered "well suited". Individual deficiencies noted included: low-level content for sophisticated teachers, the need for more emphasis on the culturally disadvantaged, and the need for more emphasis on remedial reading.

C.3. How effective have outside speakers or consultants been in advancing the purposes of the Institute? — The paid outside speakers and consultants were generally considered to be excellent and very helpful. However, the unpaid consultants, especially those from publishing companies, were considered by many not to have served the purposes of the Institutes. One Director recommended that the talks should be longer to give the speaker time to make an effective contribution. Others felt that there was not enough effective interaction between speakers and participants, and that the content was too theoretical.

C.4. To what extent has your program increased awareness of the wide range of instructional approaches? — A great deal of increased awareness was acknowledged by most Directors. However, too much increase in awareness was suggested by one Director who felt a limited approach might have been more successful. Another Director felt that there should be a greater variety of approaches.

C.5. What special emphasis has characterized your instructional program? — Characteristic of the majority of programs was the emphasis on: independent study and individualizing instruction; translating theory into practice and achieving a balance between the two; and using variable approaches. In some cases emphasis was given to the use of educational television or to the critical evaluation of new reading programs and materials.

C.6. What is the relative emphasis given to lecture, discussion, consultant, media, work and study sessions? — Generally the Directors stated that they had a balanced program with approximately equal emphasis placed on lecture and discussion, with appropriate emphasis given to consultants and media, and to work and study sessions; a few, however, indicated that they emphasized either lecture sessions or work sessions depending upon the content to be taught. One Director believed that there was entirely too much emphasis placed on lectures, requiring too many work and study sessions in the evenings and on weekends.

C.7. What means have been used to translate theory into practice? — The most common approaches mentioned for translating theory into practice were demonstrations, the use of educational television, films, and short trips. Many individual projects were designed to stimulate and inform the learner. Self-evaluation was mentioned as a valuable way of helping to reach a self-understanding of needs and strengths. Individual projects, tests, and committee work were all emphasized.

C.8. How have participants been prepared to report or share their experiences with their school systems? — The majority of the participants developed written projects in the form of term papers, syllabi, summaries and sourcebooks to implement their individual plans of action, and also taped lectures and oral reports. Some Directors stated that little had been done in the way of organized follow-up. It was suggested that financial assistance was needed to help participants and staff communicate following the Institute.

C.9. What recommendations would you make on approaches for future Institutes? — Among the stated recommendations "more emphasis on translating theory into practice" appeared most frequently. Approximately equal emphasis was placed on having more individual attention and having a more balanced program. The need for careful selection of consultants, was suggested to raise the quality of presentations. It was felt that there should be a better follow-up program, more work with children, and more small group work.

D. Coordination

D.1. How have the various components of the Institute been integrated to acheive the stated objectives? — The various components of the Institute have been integrated chiefly through staff discussions, but also through advance planning sessions. Most included individual work demonstrations and lecture discussion sessions. Some Institutes reported no special plan for integrating components.

D.2. What recommendations would you make on coordination for future Institutes? — For the most part, Directors stated that they had no recommendations to make. There were a few Directors who felt that an Associate Director should be assigned to work closely with the program, that there should be better communication with college administration and academic departments, and that there should be open discussions, and more pre-planning.

E. Measurement

E.1. What measurement techniques are you using with your participants (e.g. attitudes, knowledges, applications, etc.)? — Repeatedly Directors answered, "tests"; post-tests, pretests, and others. There was a large diversity among the responses which in addition to tests included: final papers, group presentations, individual projects, informal evaluation and discussion, oral reports, and case histories of/and work with children.

E.2. How effective has measurement been in your program? — Over three-fourths of the Directors felt that measurement had been quite appropriate and effective; about one-half of these were very enthusiastic. There were, however, some strongly negative reactions to examinations for evaluation.

E.3. What other means of evaluation are you employing? — A considerable number answered that measurement techniques were emphasized but that informal observations played an important role in evaluation.

E.4. What recommendations would you make on measurement for future Institutes? — The majority of the Directors want measurement for future Institutes kept very much as it is; although, a significant number of people complained about too many formal written exams and the fact that there was a great deal of pressure for grades. Recommendations for future Institutes included more pretests to aid in individual instruction, more follow-up measures to determine effectiveness and more individual projects instead of group measurement.

F. Physical Arrangements

F.1. Office facilities for Director and instructors: describe and evaluate. — A very large percentage of the Directors had office space classified as adequate or excellent and generally shared by other staff members. A few of the Directors had their own private offices, but those that did not were usually situated in large air-conditioned, well supplied rooms. There were, however, a few comments about offices being overcrowded, too small and inadequately supplied. Some of the Directors merely had desks in their classrooms, since there was no office space available. For many this was considered adequate. Those few Directors who had offices or space rated as inadequate were concerned about air-conditioning, supplies and distance from classes.

F.2. Dormitory arrangements: describe and comment on. Note especially whether participants are being housed with other summer school students. — Dormitory arrangements were best described as "excellent". Dormitories shared with regular campus students were indicated about as often as dormitories shared with other participants only. There was a single instance in which the Director had to make special housing arrangements. In another situation the Director was required to observe all regular dormitory rules and hours resulting in much criticism from participants.

F.3. Dining arrangements: describe and comment on. Note especially whether participants are dining with other summer school students. — Comments about dining arrangements ranged from fair to excellent with the majority of the responses being excellent. Slightly more of the Institute groups dined with summer school students than with other participants only. Most of the dining areas were in the college cafeterias or student centers. Special arrangements included: special dining rooms for participants, dormitories, snack bars, and canteen trucks. There were two instances where no dining facilities were provided.

F.4. Classrooms: give number and comment on. Note especially whether Institute rooms are isolated. — The number of classrooms ranged from one to fifteen. Several of the Directors reported having use of only one general classroom. Some of the Directors reported having use of an entire school building, a factor that greatly implemented the Institute program. Some Directors having use of only one room were very disappointed in the limited space. Several Institutes were isolated. Those that were not reported problems with cramped space, distracting noise, and much confusion.

F.5. Workshop: describe. Note especially whether or not a student can work in it quietly by himself. Also note how frequently it is used. — Workshop space was provided most frequently within the regular classroom. However in a few cases a special workroom had been provided. When the classroom was used very few Directors reported this as a satisfactory condition. When a workroom had been provided, the program could be presented in a quiet atmosphere. Workrooms were provided in dormitories, A-V rooms, libraries, and cafeterias. Many times these places were reported to be too noisy and crowded. Special workrooms were found to be in constant use and highly recommended.

F.6. Equipment: indicate audio-visual devices, mimeograph machine, and other equipment used, and comment on. — An extremely wide range of equipment was used including common A-V equipment such as a filmstrip projector and special equipment such as the controlled reader. Almost all responses indicated that the participants had access to all of the equipment that they required. However, a few responses suggested that the machines available were often hard to locate and in some cases in need of repair. Closed-circuit television, photocopiers, thermo-fax machines, Keystone telebinoculars, tachistoscopes, and Perceptoscopes were utilized in a few instances. Film projectors, mimeograph machines, tape recorders, overhead projectors, and controlled readers were frequently used.

F.7. Library facilities: indicate especially the availability of books and of periodicals needed by the Workshop participants. — Three-fourths of the responses indicated that the library facilities were adequate. The few inadequately supplied libraries were said to be deficient in journals, professional books, and bibliographies. More often than not the Institute participants had access to the college library, a special Institute library, and all of the materials in the college's curriculum or reading center.

F.8. Materials rooms: describe and evaluate. — The Directors in general were pleased with the well-equipped materials rooms. They were usually open for much of the Institute term and were easily accessible. Some Institutes had no separate materials room and had to make use of already crowded A-V rooms, classrooms or lecture rooms.

F.9. Distances between centers of Workshop activity. — Distances between centers of workshop activity can be classified as "too scattered", "scattered, yet close", and "located in same building". A slight majority of the responses fell into the last category. It was estimated, however, that some participants traveled as much as ten to fifteen miles each day.

F.10. Housing facilities for those with dependents: indicate where participants with dependent must live and how far these accommodations are from classrooms. Also indicate whether you think it is a good idea for participants to bring dependents to such an Institute. — Participants with dependents lived in dormitories, in town, at their own homes, in apartments off campus, or in boarding houses. Most frequently they lived in dormitories. However, in the majority of cases no place was provided for them. The policy of approximately one-half of the Institutes was to discourage families from coming and this was accomplished by not providing accommodations. Most of the remaining half of the Institutes were not opposed to participants bringing their familes but did not provide special housing. Generally the housing arrangements that had been made were satisfactory.

F.11. General evaluation of physical arrangements. — In almost all cases the general evaluation was "excellent". Among deficiences expressed were air conditioning, inadequate space, inadequate restrooms, insufficient classrooms, few materials and limited work space.

F.12. Recommendations on physical arrangements for Directors of future Institutes. — The majority of responses indicated no recommendations because the participants were quite well satisfied. Among the few recommendations given were the following: the distance between classrooms should be closer, more office space should be provided, air conditioning should be adequate, regular students should be separated from participants, housing arrangements should be made so participants would be more closely grouped, and workrooms should be provided.

IV. Summary

A. What have been the most valuable aspects of the Institute? — The opportunity for participants to work together and share their problems and ideas was a very important aspect of the Institutes. Exposure to many new ideas aided in developing some important attitudes and a substantial growth in interest. Many of the Directors recognized the value in pracitcal experiences and especially work with children. A good balance between theory and practice was suggested as a valuable feature in many Institutes.

B. What are the chief problems which you encountered with the Institute? — Probably the factor that presented the greatest problem was the tightness of the schedule and the great amount of material that had to be covered. In a few cases participants and Directors expressed strong feelings about the lack of administrative support that they were receiving regarding salaries, secretarial help, quarters, materials, and publicity. Some complained of too much paper work. Inadequate preplanning was also noted as a problem. Staff conflicts disturbed the progress of one Institute.

C. Can the major needs in reading instruction for teachers in your area be substantially met by an Institute approach? — All of the Directors replied "yes" to this question with the qualification that there must be more if the program is to gain the inertia necessary for maximum impact.

D. What types of Institutes would be most appropriate in terms of the needs of teachers in your area and the administration and organization of your Institution? — The Directors speaking for themselves and for the participants indicated the need for Institutes for principals and supervisors. It was suggested that change was difficult to effect without an enlightened administration. The desire for additional Code Three Institutes was most frequently expressed.

E. What are your plans to follow-up with observations of the participants to determine the effectiveness of Institute experiences? — The Directors planned to send out questionnaires in almost all Institutes, in addition to making one or more observations and visits to the local schools. The Directors in most cases planned to send letters to superintendents or principals informing them of Institute experiences and participant effectiveness. Several Institutes made plans for participants to give reports of their experiences; these reports were to be evaluated and improved when necessary.

F. To what extent will you and your staff make use of Institute approaches and practices in future teacher training programs? — Either the Directors had given little consideration to this problem or they did not feel that it was a function of the Institute to prepare for the training of other teachers. In almost every case the only staff plans were for informal teacher sharing. However, in special cases reference materials were going to be placed in the curriculum library, a monograph on what a good basal reader should be was going to be circulated, and a Reading practicum was going to be placed in the regular graduate program.

G. What is your general appraisal of the success of this Institute? — With only a few minor changes in the program all Institutes were rated by their Directors as highly successful or excellent.

Staff Responses to Check-List Items

I. General Aims and Objectives

A. The primary objective of the Institute is to improve reading instruction. How well do you think this aim is being achieved? — It was indicated by the majority of staff members that the major objective was being met very well. They felt that the variety of materials, demonstrations, and teaching methods was of great value to the Institute. Some felt that the Institute was more successful than they had expected, particularly for those participants with very limited backgrounds.

B. Which of the stated Institute objectives do you feel are being successfully accomplished? — It was thought that all of them were being touched upon in some way. The new methods and approaches that were presented were reported to be of great value. Diversity of grade level created some difficulty in adapting instruction to participant needs.

C. Which of the stated Institute objectives do you feel are not being achieved? — It was reported that there should be fewer stated objectives and that these few should have been more thoroughly accomplished. More time for actual use of materials would have helped and more emphasis given to teaching reading to culturally deprived children.

D. What recommendations would you make on objectives for future Institutes? — Again it was stated that there should be fewer objectives and more thoroughly reinforced objectives, especially with application activities. Some would emphasize remedial reading for the upper elementary grades.

II. Organization and Administration

A. Size of the Institute

A.3. What is your opinion about the size of the Institute? — The majority of staff felt that the best size was 35 to 40 participants. They indicated that individual guidance was very important, and that it would be difficult to achieve if the Institutes were much larger.

A.4. What recommendations would you make on size for future Institutes? — Thirty-five to forty participants would be about right. Anything over this would necessitate a larger staff and special facilities.

B.1.b. What recommendations would you make on length of term for future Institutes? — The majority felt that six weeks was about optimal because it coordinated well with other summer programs. Six weeks would also enable participants to arrange some vacation time.

B.2. Work Schedule

B.2.b. What recommendations would you make on scheduling work loads for future Institutes? — Some felt that fewer topics should be covered and covered in greater depth. Fewer class hours was felt to be important, facilitating independent study, research and private conferences or small group conferences with the staff.

B.3. Extra Curricular Activities

B.3.b. To what extent have they contributed to the success of the program? — Answers to this question can be classified under one of the following two categories: 1) extra curricular activities were not emphasized. 2) extra curricular activities contributed greatly to the success of the Institute. They were extremely beneficial for promoting good group relations. The answers were about equally distributed under these two categories.

B.3.c. What recommendations would you make on extra curricular activities for future Institutes? — Many felt that the activity programs should not be changed. Some thought that a budget provision should be made for activities such as buffet dinners or a final luncheon. Others felt that extra curricular activities should be planned as needed.

B.5. Staff

B.5.c. What percentage of your time are you giving to the Institute? — Repeatedly staff members indicated that they were giving 100% of their time to the Institute. A few indicated 50%; this reduction in time relating to the other obligations to the college or local school.

B.5.e. What experience have you had in teaching reading? — The staff members generally had several years of teaching experience ranging from six to eighteen years. Among the experiences indicated were the following: published books, taught graduate courses, directed workshops, administered as a principal, and/or taught as an elementary or secondary teacher.

B.6. Staff Meetings

B.6.c. What recommendations would you make to improve the staff meetings of future Institutes? — A large percentage of staff members had no recommendations to make while some were very specific in their concern to improve efficiency. The need for more preplanning was mentioned often so that materials would arrive on time, meeting schedules would be more flexible, and plenty of secretarial assistance would be available when needed.

B.7. Staff

B.7.b. Was the briefing ample? — All but three of the responses were "yes".

Those who said "no" stated that they required more time to achieve role clarity.

B.7.d. What recommendations would you make on staff meetings for future Institutes? — The majority of staff members had no recommendations, stating that meetings had been adequate. A few members expressed the need for more staff meetings, for better planning, and orientation.

B.8. Participants

B.8.a.(6) What is your general appraisal of the participants in terms of their reaction to the Institute and general enthusiasm? — There were only a few negative remarks concerning participants. Most staff members agreed that participants were unusually enthusiastic and hardworking.

B.8.b.(2) What recommendations would you make on selection criteria for future Institutes? — Surprisingly, some of the staff members knew little about the selection criteria and indicated their desire to be informed. Others wanted the criteria to remain as they were. There were many remarks about the needs of participants -- that those whose needs were greater should have been selected. It was recommended that school principals be included in this group.

III. Program and Practices

B. Materials

B.1. Are the materials which you are using adequate to the purposes of the Institute? — Responses were primarily affirmative. A few reported need for more text books, more periodicals, more machines, or more supplementary books.

B.6. What recommendations would you make on materials for future Institutes? — It was frequently remarked that, "In the future materials should be purchased through budget procedures". Extensive follow-up to check on the use being made of the materials was also recommended. Many members had no recommendations to make.

C. Approaches

C.1. How effectively has instruction been meeting the needs of the participants (level, load, method)? — Most staff members answered "very effectively". Others considered the pace too fast, considering the heavy load.

C.2. How suited is the content of the Institute to the background and needs of the participants? — Many of the staff members stated that at the beginning of the Institute they were concerned about the participants' poor backgrounds; this however, became less important as time went on. Others felt that the content was very well suited to backgrounds.

C.3. How effective have outside speakers or consultants been in advancing the purposes of the Institute? — Outside speakers and consultants in general were considered to be very effective. One comment which typified negative reaction was "authorities brought 'canned speeches'". It was suggested that visiting lecturers carefully tailor their topics for the Institute.

C.4. To what extent has your program increased awareness of the wide range of instructional approaches? — All responses clearly indicated that programs were highly successful in increasing awareness of the wide range of instructional approaches.

C.5. What special emphasis has characterized your instructional program? — The eclectic approach to individual needs was often emphasized. Emphasis was also placed on practicum, lectures, group sessions, new instructional approaches, and individual remedial techniques.

C.6. What is the relative emphasis given to lecture, discussion, consultant, media, work and study sessions? — Most staff members reported a good balance with approximately equal time given to work-study sessions and to lecture-discussion sessions. Some members stated a need for more lecture and more discussion.

C.7. What means have been used to translate theory into practice? — Demonstrations, classroom experiences, and the development of individual materials and projects were most widely reported. In addition, case histories, practicum and group sessions were suggested as valuable approaches to translating theory into practice.

C.9. What recommendations would you make on approaches for future Institutes? — Recommendations included the need to carefully select consultants and salesmen and also to have more preplanning, more work with children, and better follow-up activities.

D. Coordination

D.2. What recommendations would you make on coordination for future Institutes? — Many had no recommendations. Others advised the use of a team approach and more frequent planning and discussion sessions.

E. Measurement

E.2. How effective has measurement been in your program? — The great majority of the responses were, "very effective". The others felt it was too early to tell, or that more evaluation should be included.

E.4. What recommendations would you make on measurement for future Institutes? — Those who did not feel that measurement was adequate felt that there should be more examinations, more pretests, more actual practice and more follow-up.

F. Physical Arrangements

F.11. General evaluation of physical arrangements. — In general the staff members thought physical arrangements were adequate. Inadequate arrangements highlighted were poor air conditioning and insufficient room space.

F.12. Recommendations on physical arrangements for Directors of future Institutes. — Recommendations most often emphasized were the need for improved air conditioning and more space--space for offices, work areas, libraries, and conference rooms.

IV. Summary

A. What have been the most valuable aspects of the Institute? — Changed attitudes, broadened understandings, integrated theory and practice, and development of new methods and materials have been the most valuable aspects identified by staff members.

B. What are the chief problems which you encountered with the Institutes? — The administration in some cases was not providing Institute staff with support through secretarial help and improvement of physical arrangements. There was occasionally a lack of some necessary materials. The most troublesome problem was finding enough time for all that had to be accomplished.

C. Can the major needs in reading instruction for teachers in your area be substantially met by an Institute approach? — Most of the staff members felt that major needs could be met through this approach and expressed a desire for many Institutes of the same type.

G. What is your general appraisal of the success of this Institute? — "Excellent", "successful", and "good" were the only comments received. Most often the Institute was reported to have been "successful".

Summary: Director and Staff

General Aims and Objectives

Agreement was unanimous that the general objective, to improve the qualifications of individuals, was accomplished as a result of Institute experiences. However, the degree of improvement to be achieved was limited by the experience backgrounds of participants. Specific objectives indentified as particularly well met included: the development of operational plans for classroom use, awareness and understanding of a variety of techniques and materials, management of the classroom situation, linguistic and new media knowledge, and awareness of the nature and complexity of the reading process. Several objectives were neglected or difficult to attain in the time available. Notable among these were: the development of research orientation and background, understanding of critical and creative reading, and use of equipment and materials. Objectives were clearly too broad. Major recommendations called for a smaller number of objectives more intensively pursued.

Size of Institute

Institute enrollments ranged from twenty to eighty participants. Drop-outs were rare and due to illness when they occurred. The most common enrollment was forty participants which was considered a manageable number even though available facilities and staff size were thought important in determining size. Communication and individual contact were important factors in that recommendation.

Schedule

Length of Institute term ranged from four to eight weeks. Most Directors felt a six-week term would most effectively accomplish Institute objectives and coordinate with school and college schedules. Work loads were heavy and scheduled from twenty to forty hours per week. Additional evening scheduling was arranged in some programs. A general feeling of satisfaction with scheduling was evident among the Directors. Recommendations for change called for reduction in scheduled time with thirty to thirty-five hours considered optimal. Extra curricular activities were included in Institute programs. A few Directors felt them useful but incidental adjuncts to the program, while most valued them highly for rapport and informal idea exchange.

Administration

Directors were generally of high academic rank and extensive teaching experience. Predominantly reading specialists, the Directors felt reading experience essential to the effective administration of an Institute. However, a few Directors believed their duties so administrative that reading backgrounds would not be required. College Deans were instrumental in selecting the majority of Institute Directors. The time devoted to the Institute by the Directors was almost universally reported to be 100%. A few Directors reported also spending 50% time in the spring term. Directing an Institute was clearly thought to be a full time job with additional time needed during the preceding term. Directors generally selected staff members. Strong support by College administrative officials was reported throughout. A few instances were noted, however, in which support was not adequate. Difficulties were usually related to negotiations with business offices. Full time secretarial help was considered necessary during the Institute and during the preceding term. Additional clerical help was also thought to be essential. Pre-Institute briefings were felt to be vaulable, and the recommendation was made for increased time and support.

Participants

The Reading Institutes were well publicized. Participant response was large. Inadequate Institute descriptions created unwieldy screening and correspondence problems. Among the most common selection criteria were: recommendations from supervisors, statements of purpose, college transcripts, and plans for future service. Participants were given no preference by colleges from which they graduated. Most accepted when invitations were extended. A few, however, received multiple invitations and could be selective. Directors were highly satisfied with the type of participants obtained. They were described as being enthusiastic, cooperative and hard working. Regional selection was suggested as an aid to follow-up activities. A strong recommendation was also made that participants be better alerted to the demands that would be made of them.

Congruence

Modifications in Institute plans of operation were minor and generally were concerned with overly-tight work schedules. Some adjustments were made to give participants more opportunity for individual projects. Some few made modifications so as to accomodate additional guest lecturers or to provide more discussion time.

Materials

The effective use of materials was said to be a major factor in Institute success. Most Directors believed that materials were being use appropriately. However, a few Directors reported that materials were introduced in such profusion that the effect was distracting and that no real analysis of materials in depth was possible. Even so, a variety of material was considered to be important and more material would have been generally welcomed. Much of the material in the Institute programs was acquired without expense from commercial book exhibits, college centers, or participant's personal resources.

In addition, teacher and committee-made materials contributed in an important way. Among materials developed this way were source books, handbooks, and audio-visual aids. New materials were received continuously from publishers in most Institutes, and Directors judged this source of materials to be of great value. New media were incorporated into most programs effectively, but experiences in the use of new media were limited. Materials were felt to play such an important role in Institute success that it was thought budgetary provision for their purchase should be extended.

Approaches

Programs were judged by the Directors to be meeting the needs of the participants very effectively. Schedules were for the most part well balanced but exceedingly demanding. Approaches used included lecture-discussion sessions, demonstrations, discussion groups, individual counseling, and independent study and research. In many programs intensive work with children was considered an integral component. Reading sophistication was not as uniform as had been expected by most Directors, and the recommendation was made that better provision be made to accommodate individual differences.

Visiting speakers and consultants contributed to most programs and were generally considered very helpful. Publishers' representatives appeared to be the least effective contributors and should be carefully selected. When outside consultants or lecturers were used Directors felt that an extensive involvement in the Institute was important. It was, therefore, strongly recommended that visiting lecturers spend at least two days with the Institute taking an active part in its program in addition to their presentations. Since visiting lecturers had a tendency to over-theorize, it was recommended that lecture content be better adapted to the context of the Institute.

The wide range of materials and methods available was emphasized and considered valuable by most Institute Directors.

Additional areas of emphasis were reported to be independent study, individualizing instruction, translating theory into practice, and the critical evaluation of new reading programs and materials. Whenever Directors indicated that programs were not adequately balanced, they recommended less lecture-discussion and more practicum and individual project time. Written projects in the form of term papers, syllabi, summaries, and source books were developed as an aid to extending experiences following the Institute. Taped lecture and oral reports appeared to be useful devices.

Organized follow-up was not well planned in most Institutes and additional financial assistance for that purpose was a frequent recommendation. Among the strongest and most frequently made recommendations was work with children. The most common approaches to integrating Institute components were reported to have been staff discussions and thorough advanced planning sessions.

Measurement

A variety of measurement techniques was reported by most Institute Directors. Post-tests and pretests were reported in addition to final papers, group presentations, individual projects and informal evaluation and discussion. Measurement techniques were felt to have been effective by most Directors. A notable exception was the use of examinations as a prerequisite to grading. Directors observed that participants were hard working and responsible and were in many cases productively occupied on individual projects which had to be discontinued for examination study. It was recommended that more use be made of pre-tests to facilitate individual instruction and that follow-up measures be employed to determine Institute effectiveness.

Physical Arrangements

Office space was generally considered adequate, although some Directors shared offices with other staff members. Among the limitations reported in a few instances were overcrowding, small size, and inadequate supply provisions. Occasionally, Directors operated from desks in the Institute classroom. Air-conditioning problems were identified in a few instances. Office conditions were generally considered satisfactory.

Dormitory arrangements for participants were described as excellent. Dormitories shared with other summer school students were considered satisfactory, but advantages were indicated for conditions in which participants lived closely together. Dining arrangements were generally made with college cafeterias or student centers. Special arrangements included dormitories, snackbars, canteen trucks or special dining rooms. In some Institutes, participants were kept together for meals and in others they dined with regular summer school students. No strong recommendations were reported for dining arrangements.

Considerable variation was observed in the number of classrooms available to the Institutes. These ranged from one to fifteen. Some Directors felt seriously limited by a single classroom while others reported an entire school building available for the Institute. The availability of classroom space was judged to be an important factor in Institute success. Institute isolation was considered important to avoid distracting noises and confusion. Workshop space was an important provision and was most frequently located in the regular classroom. Where special workrooms were provided they were used extensively and considered to be of great value.

Directors reported a great variety of equipment employed in the Institute programs. Most Institutes included such common equipment as film-strip projectors, mimeograph machines, tape recorders, over-head projectors and typewriters. Special equipment represented in the Institute programs include controlled readers, closed-circuit television, photocopiers, thermo-fax machines, telebinoculars, tachistoscopes and perceptoscopes.

Library facilities were considered adequate by three-fourths of the Directors. Those reporting inadequate facilities indicated deficiencies in journals, professional books, and bibliographies. Both college and special Institute libraries were generally available. Several universities had special reading center libraries on which the Institutes could draw. Materials rooms were thought to be of great value and it was recommended that they be both convenient and available to participants during non-Institute hours. Most Institute activity centers were located in the same building or closely grouped. A few however, were judged to be too widely scattered, causing participants to walk several miles a day. Special provision was rarely made for participants with dependents. Those participants arranged their own accommodations, which were reported to have been satisfactory.

Follow-up

Follow-up plans were generally vague and not emphasized during pre-Institute planning sessions. However, a number of suggestions were given by Directors for possible follow-up activities. These included letters to superintendents or principals informing them of Institute experiences and the effectiveness of participants, post-Institute questionnaires to participants, visits by Director and staff to local schools, participant news letters and report planning sessions during the Institute. Second year Institutes were frequently recommended. Several Directors intended to prepare participants to share Institute experiences and assume in-service leadership. The extension of the Institute to the local schools was accomplished through individual projects in which plans of operation were developed and through the accumulation of Institute materials such as taped lectures and oral reports.

Summary

Institute experiences were unanimously rated by the Directors as successful. Among the most valuable factors identified were: opportunity for participants to work together and share their problems and ideas, understanding of the nature and the complexity of the reading process, attention given to the provision for individual differences, exposure to wide range of methods and materials, and practical experiences working with children.

Tight scheduling created a problem in many Institutes. Objectives were ambitious and time was limited.

Directors felt they were not able to adequately cover all of the material in the time available. Additional problems were reported in some cases related to administrative support, secretarial help, office space, and inadequate pre-Institute publicity.

The Reading Institute as an approach to meeting the needs of teachers in the various geographic areas was rated excellent with the qualification that additional Institutes of similar type would be necessary if maximum benefit were to accrue from such a problem. Directors felt that one other good way to effect change in reading instruction would be Reading Institute programs for principals and supervisors.

INTERVIEWS WITH PARTICIPANTS

Responses to Check-list Items

Participants were interviewed by each member of a visiting team. Not all participants at an Institute were interviewed by an evaluator. Usually they were selected on a random order basis. The following check-list items were used to guide the interview.

The responses as recorded here represent a collation as was true of the accounts of the administrators and staffs reported in the previous section. The regional evaluator collated the notes of his team. These collations were then combined into a representative statement for each item by the Director, the Associate Director, and the coordinator of this survey. These collations were reviewed at the Boulder meeting by the Regional Directors to determine the degree to which the digest statements were representative and acceptable. Adjustments were then made as recommended and resubmitted to the Regional Director in writing for comments. From this resulted the following digest statements for each item.

I. General Objectives

1.1 How many of the general aims of this Institute do you remember? — The number of general objectives declared by the different Institutes ranged from one general objective accompanied by fourteen specific objectives to ten general objectives. The average number of objectives declared might be estimated at about five.

Participants interviewed in group situations could recall most of the objectives set forth by an Institute. Usually, though, their recall was vague about specifics. This was true even though in one instance the respondents had been primed the week before the visitation was made.

1.2 How well do you think the general aims of this Institute are being achieved? — Even though responses to question (1) had shown only general recall of objectives, responses to this question ranged from "fairly well" to "excellent". In almost every instance responses to objectives concerned with materials received a consistent high rating, even though one Institute visited did not have library facilities available. In general, respondents wished more had been done with the practical aspect of methods of teaching and that opportunities to work with children had been provided.

1.3 What were your objectives in applying to this Institute? — Repeatedly respondents said they wanted to become more effective teachers. This high hope could be interpreted as being all-embracing and included concern for methodology, for students, and for school programs. Even so, in many instances, respondents gave voice to these ambitions by naming them specifically as well.

1.4 What objectives did you have that have not been achieved? — Most of the responses to this question could be classed under a one-word category "none". A goodly number also came under the "good-but" category. The "buts" were concerned with lack of practical experience with children, insufficient emphasis on methods or over-emphasis of one method, and lack of opportunity to translate ideas into a course of action for their home schools.

1.5 What recommendations do you have concerning general objectives for Directors of future Institutes? — Overwhelmingly, the respondents recommended more opportunity to work with children under supervision so that ideas theorized could be tested and so that some teaching skill could be acquired. In a goodly number of instances respondents urged that different views be presented so that participants could better judge the merit of the single approach being stressed. Even though most Institutes had stated that attention would be given to a range of reading levels (K-6 or 7-12) many participants felt that one level was over-stressed (primary or junior high). Limiting the number of Institute objectives was urged.

2. Size of Institute

2.1 What is your opinion about the size of the group in the Institute? — The range of opinions expressed here is considerable. Some felt an Institute with one-hundred participants wasn't too large and others felt that they should be limited to twenty or twenty-five. In general, the range suggested as workable was thirty to forty.

Some of the Institutes had regularly scheduled group sessions and this helped overcome the liabilities of a large single unit. A good recommendation mentioned on several occasions was to keep group size small enough so that respondents could work together effectively.

2.2 What is your opinion about small group meetings? — The participants' opinions could best be classed under two labels: "more" and "extremely valuable". Almost unanimous agreement was evident in the thirty-three reports submitted. Some did express the opinion that group effectiveness could be improved if an able instructor participated. Others felt that the informal coffee break gatherings and the like were priceless opportunities. Apparantly, much sharing occurred during the group sessions both formal and informal.

2.3 What is your opinion about the opportunity for individual counseling and guidance? — Again, responses indicated much satisfaction with the arrangements and the opportunities. In a few instances it was thought that the opportunity could have been increased if the few instructors had not been so fully scheduled. Special commendation was expressed in support of the practice of having participants and staff commonly housed. This provided opportunity for counseling.

2.4 What recommendations on size do you have for Directors of future Institutes? — Asked to give a specific recommendation resulted in more specific endorsement for the thirty to forty limit expressed earlier. Only a few now suggested group sessions as an acceptable way of increasing the total group size.

3. Schedule

3.1 What do you think about the length of terms of the Institutes? — There was strong consensus in support of the six-week time period. A number of eight-week sessions evoked the response that six weeks would have been adequate with better planning. Teachers' need for a holiday was voiced on a number of occasions as support for a six-week session.

3.2 What do you think about the length of an Institute day? — Most of the participants felt that Institute days were too long. They realized that much had to be done and they felt the usual teacher dedication to duties but they also felt that the point of diminishing returns exacted a daily toll. More time was needed for reflection and individual research said some.

3.3 What do you think about the length of an Institute week? — A five-day week was the verdict. Some suggested a four and one-half day-week to give commuters more time to commute and to ease up on the week-end use of time for homework.

3.4 What is your opinion on the extra-curricular or social activities planned as a part of this Institute? — "Mixed feelings" tends to best describe responses to this item. Most of the Institutes scheduled informal activities and where they were carefully planned they were a welcomed part of the Institute even though, as many said, not an essential part. The participants who came from distant points geographically felt that more time should have been allowed and planned for local visiting of a cultural nature.

3.5 What is your opinion on the amount of free time allowed by the Institute schedule? — "What's that?" is the response that best characterizes participant's reaction to this inquiry. This followed by "we need it" gives a good picture of their opinions. Apparently little if any free time was scheduled even for research work and this apparently was considered poor planning.

3.6 What do you think about the rigor of the schedule for non-class hours? -- Non-class hours, particularly evenings, even when not scheduled, were too demanding because of "home work" requirements. Participants said this was particularly true of the first weeks of an Institute. Participants with families and commuters voiced special objections. Cultural activities scheduled evenings met with endorsement.

3.7 What recommendations on schedules for Directors of future Institutes do you have? — As one reporter put it, most Institute schedules sinned on the topic of overcommitment. Afternoon schedules were challenged particularly. That is the time when individual study, counseling, contact with children should have been scheduled. Many expressed the need for more contact with children and hoped this would be scheduled in future Institutes.

4. Administration

4.1 What do you think was particularly good about the administration of this Institute? — The wording of this question invited a positive and favorable response. That this was not true in a fair number of instances allows for speculation of a "soul searching" nature. Those that did respond favorably usually listed good management first. Other ideas receiving favorable mention were scheduling of guest authorities, the variety of the plans, the opportunity for guidance and counseling, and the provisions for housing.

4.2 What did you think of the Director's authority as compared with his responsibility? — Generally, the participants thought the Director's authority was in keeping with his responsibility. A number of respondents referred to harassment on the part of other local administrative people as being a deterrent. In a few instances, apparently Directors had to deliberately establish themselves as in authority and participants were aware of this need and referred to it as unfortunate.

4.3 What suggestions do you have for the improvement of administration for future Institutes? — Among the suggestions "more administrative help" appeared most frequently. Others were: easing time schedule, better staff-director cooperation, more detailed information, and less structure.

5. Staff

5.1 What is your opinion of the staff of this Institute? Their qualifications; their effectiveness; their impact on you? — The response to the instructors was largely favorable and enthusiastically so. Some reasons given for the enthusiasm were: well-qualified, practical, not condescending. Some felt that the staff should have asked to do more demonstrating. Some exceptions were noted but this is to be expected and adds to the value of the comments.

Some comment was made about the level of experience and knowledge of certain staff members. Apparently there were a fair number of instances in which all of the staff were knowledgeable largely at the primary level of reading instruction and not at the intermediate and secondary level. As a result in instances little if any attention was given to secondary level reading instruction. This response seems to confirm responses to item 1.5.

5.2 What is your opinion of the visiting consultants: their qualifications, their effectiveness, their impact on you? — More positive reactions were received than negative ones. Those enthusiastic said they liked the variety, the competence, and opportunity. Those opposed or in doubt felt that the presentations had not been integrated into the total plan, that the consultants were condescending, and that some came only to promote a certain product. Book company consultants were singled out for negative comment in a fair number of instances.

5.3 How effectively were the staff and the consultant activities coordinated? — Most respondents were of the opinion that the coordination of effort could have been improved. Follow-up sessions were recommended as being helpful. Again book company representatives were singled out for criticism.

5.4 What do you think is the likelihood that ideas developed at this Institute may be carried back by Institute staff members and transmitted to pre-service teachers, thus overcoming a need on their part for similar Institutes? — Most of the participants felt that they couldn't very well make a judgment in this regard but thought that there was some likelihood that this might happen. There was considerable agreement, though, that the Institutes served such a useful purpose that staff carry-back could never replace them.

5.5 What did you think about the staff's attitude toward you? — "Excellent", "professional", "stimulating", are the terms that best describe how the participants felt about Institute staffs' attitudes toward them. Apparently rapport was good in all instances reported.

5.6 What recommendations on staff do you have for Directors of future Institutes? — Obtain staff people who can demonstrate practices they recommend and who will insist on using children was one of the most frequently mentioned recommendations. Caution was expressed concerning the overuse of national authorities. Better use of skilled local people who understood classroom teachers' needs was urged. Again book company salespeople were singled out for criticism. Continue to make every effort to integrate courses.

6. Participants

6.1 What did you think about the way you were selected to attend this Institute? — Most participants didn't know how they were selected but were pleased that they were. Institute announcements all declared eligibility regulations and it seems strange, therefore, that participants didn't know why they were chosen.

6.2 Do you think the composition of the group was in keeping with the objectives declared? — Consensus was strong and favorable. Singled out for special mention were the common needs of the members, the contribution made possible by their geographic distribution, and the value of the different degrees of experience and professional training represented. Some participants objected to the fact that the Institute population wasn't more homogeneous.

6.3 Do you think practices and procedures presented were such that they could be implemented by you and shared by you? — Many of the practices could be implemented and shared, the respondents thought. Concern was voiced over the promotion of machines and commercial items. Again, participants voiced a desire for more practical demonstrations of practices and procedures.

6.4 Did you have assurance from your local authorities that they would support your attempt to try out ideas obtained at the

Institute? — Not all participants felt that they had the self-assurance needed to try out new ideas. This concern was voiced among participants at almost every Institute. Most hoped that they could obtain support from their local authorities to put into practice the ideas obtained at the Institute.

6.5 Did your local authorities have any plans for using you in in-service programs or as a participant in local profession of organizing action meetings? — "Some said yes, but many said no" is a statement made by one regional evaluator and this seems to describe best the circumstance in the different Institutes.

6.6 What recommendations on participations do you have for Directors of future Institutes? — Specific recommendations were made as follows: Have an advanced Institute for the same participants; have the Institute aid participants with follow-up and the obtaining of local support, continue inviting participants so as to represent a geographical spread but only if the nature of the Institute permits such a distribution; invite more men to attend; invite more young teachers; have pre-Institute interviews with participants; invite more principals; provide for special interests.

7. Course Content

7.1 What means were employed to transfer theory in lectures to practical work? — Many practices were mentioned and the enthusiasm for the means used ranged from high to none. The practices of some Institutes were considered inadequate. Means listed most frequently were: role-playing; demonstrations with adults; demonstrations with children; practicums; projects; field trips.

7.2 Do you think a good balance was maintained between theory and practice? — Most of the respondents felt that there was "more theory than practice" and that circumstances should have been reversed. In only one Institute did the participants feel that there had been too much practice. A recommendation that reoccured time and again was for the use of children.

7.3 Do you think the course content reflected good appreciation for the contributions from related disciplines? — Respondents were pleased with the attention given to related disciplines. In some few instances they were enthusiastic and in some few instances they voiced concern. Two areas mentioned favorably were psychology and sociology.

7.4 Do you think the course content was realistically related to the Institutes' objectives? — "Yes" was the answer and the only answer noted in twenty-two of the replies. The others were all qualified "yes" replies except one. In this instance the respondents said that not only was the course content unrealistic but also they resented the erroneous assumptions made about their backgrounds and abilities.

7.5 Was the course content congruent with your expectations? — Again the majority of the replies was "yes". In some instances the "yes" was qualified by adding that they had received more than they had expected. In about one-fourth of the instances respondents had expected more work with children and were disappointed.

7.6 What did you think about the different aspects of reading instruction dealt with at this Institute? — A majority of the Institutes were rated excellent on this aspect of their presentation. However, most of the replies were qualified. Concern was expressed because in instances one procedure was singled out as a panacea and overstressed. One Institute received an enthusiastic rating on the use of television. In fact, the evaluator added a hardy endorsement in a parenthesized comment.

7.7 Which aspect of reading instruction did you find most impressive? — Two aspects of reading instruction that were most impressive were "individualized instruction" and "remedial and diagnostic procedures". The former was interpreted as meaning help for individual pupils more than "individualized" instruction as compared with "group" instruction.

7.8 What methods of presentation did you find most effective? — The "lecture-discussion" method was endorsed as the most effective and it seems was used most frequently. In some instances the use of "media-devices" was mentioned as being particularly helpful.

7.9 What were the salient features of the courses presented? — In a goodly number of instances this item was considered redundant. In those instances in which replies were received the respondents used the generic "practical" and "revealing".

7.10 What recommendations on course content do you have for Directors of future Institutes? — Recommendations made reflected clearly the responses made to previous items in this area. This consistency has significance. Items meriting repeating were: more work with children; more visits to schools or classrooms; better use of new media; more observation; more opportunity for participants to work with children and be observed by a supervisor; more concern about upper grade level and high school level reading instruction; less emphasis on a panacea; and plan courses and schedules so that Institute Directors could teach.

8. Practicums

8.1 What did you think about the integration of methods and materials? — "Excellent" is the rating that occurred most frequently. Qualified ratings listed such items as: too much commercial emphasis; too much method; not enough on how to use materials displayed and briefly described.

8.2 What did you think about the seminar-type sessions? — "Seminar", "Practicum", and "Circle" seemed to be used synonymously and to obtain a consistent high endorsement. The three terms seemed to describe the circumstances adequately. (Seated in a circle or around a table was a practical way to have participants participate.)

8.3 Did you think the schedule allowed adequately for such activities? — Either the respondents were pleased with the schedule provision for Practicums or they thought even more time should have been allotted. Caution was voiced here, though, in that some suggested that the sessions should definitely be supervised.

8.4 What recommendations do you have about practicums for Directors of future Institutes? — Over and over again respondents suggested the use of children for demonstration purposes and for student teaching "experience" and thought that the practicum time was the time to be practical. Supervised seminars were highly endorsed.

9. Tests

9.1 What did you think about the way the Institute measured your progress? — Replies to this question indicate that in most instances the participants were uninformed about the tests they were to take, didn't know the results of tests they had taken, and in instances didn't even know that they were to be tested. In some cases, participants did report satisfaction with the way they were being measured.

9.2 What procedure for measuring the achievement of your children did you find most impressive? — Informal teacher prepared tests earned approval and appreciation in many instances. In most instances standardized tests were either not considered, dealt with only briefly, or seemed unrelated to the objectives set. Participants felt strongly about these conditions and the lack of specific help.

9.3 As a result of the Institute, do you think you are more sensitive to the value of school records as a guide for differentiating instruction? — Generally respondents felt that they were more sensitive to the value of records but the lack of enthusiasm along with the desire to know more specifically how records help seems to appraise the circumstances. Records should not come under the "busy work" category neither should they be overlooked as a source of help. How records can be of specific help in an instructional situation seems to have puzzled participants.

9.4 Do you think you have learned how to make use of both informal and formal tests to determine learner needs? — Participants felt that they had learned how to make more effective use of informal tests but generally felt that this was not true about the use of standardized tests.

9.5 What recommendations do you have concerning tests for Directors of future Institutes? — The recommendations were as vague and indecisive as were the reactions to the four items under the test category. All felt that more should be done in this area, but were uncertain as to what should be done. Participants did, however, urge that more attention be given to the role of standardized tests in the total reading instruction program, particularly the uses of test results for instructional purposes.

10. Follow-up

10.1 What kind of follow-up would you like to have as a result of this Institute? — All were agreed that some form of follow-up should be done if at all possible. Of the proposals made, two occurred with some regularity: a visit in the participant's school by the Institute Director or a staff member; and, another Institute. Also suggested with some frequency was the proposal for a mid-winter get-together of the participants and the

Institute staff. Other ideas meriting mention were a questionnaire, more advanced work to be taken in a local Institution, a newsletter.

10.2 Do you think Institute follow-up through your school administrators or supervisors would be advisable? — Opinions were sharply divided. Some said "Yes, positively"; others said "Definitely, no". The following idea, "Perhaps a letter or a memo would help", received considerable support. All in all, participants expressed concern about the prospects of such action.

10.3 What do you think about doing additional work, taking college courses, participating in in-service programs, pursuing a degree program, attending other institutes as a follow-up on this Institute? — Attending other institutes was singled out as the most desired form of follow-up. Taking college courses received endorsement but only mildly so. Participation in in-service programs received a guarded reply and an "if this" - type of qualification.

10.4 Do you see any carry-over of reading instructional procedures to the content areas? — Consensus was a strong "Yes", and particularly in the language arts.

10.5 How has your attitude toward professional organizations been influenced by this Institute? — "No response" was obtained in a large number of instances. Some did express interest in joining such organizations as NCTE and IRA. Some indicated that they had been reading the journals published by these organizations and they would continue to do so.

10.6 Would you have preferred to attend an Institute that did not offer college credit and thus avoided the need for tests and a grade? —"A resounding no", and "ninety-nine percent no", are two comments that best describe reactions to this item. Participants linked credit and salary increment together and made few comments about credits and professional improvement and degree attainment.

10.7 What recommendations do you have concerning follow-up for Directors of future Institutes? — In reply to this item, participants added an idea not expressed earlier. Institute plans should provide for follow-up, and this should be required for approval by the U.S. Office of Education. Proposals advanced again were: Visits by the Institute Director and by staff if possible; a mid-winter reunion of participants; an advanced Institute next year for the same participants; a questionnaire; and a newsletter.

11. Resources

11.1 What did you think about the library facilities available at this Institute? — Replies rated library facilities from inadequate to excellent. Some suggested a special Institute library or a special center for participants in a university library.

11.2 What did you think about the materials available for your use? — Apparently every Institute had available a good supply of materials, at least this is what the participants said without qualifications.

11.3 What did you think about the educational media available for use? — Generally speaking, all were pleased with the use of new media and singled out television for special commendation.

11.4 What recommendations on resources do you have for Directors of future Institutes? — Even though reaction to materials had been an unqualified "good", certain specific recommendations were made. Materials should be better organized for use prior to Institutes getting started; materials could be better organized into interest areas and instructional levels; separate rooms should be provided to house materials so that participants could use the facilities without disturbing other activities; and participants should be allowed more free time so that materials could be examined carefully and leisurely.

12. New Approaches

12.1 What new approaches did you learn about at this Institute? — "Everything, in our opinion, was new to most participants", is how one visiting team reported on a particular Institute and this seems to be the answer that best describes responses to new approaches. While many listed specific ideas that were considered new, two things were apparent: the same "new" ideas were listed again and again; and, the "new" and the "old" were confused in many people's minds. Some expressed caution about the over-emphasis of one "new" idea.

12.2 Did you become familiar with the theory underlying the new approaches? — Theory as well as content about new approaches was being given most Institute participants. The majority felt satisfied on this score.

12.3 What did you learn about new approaches other than projective devices? — Replies to this item reflected satisfactory learning about new approaches other than mechanical devices. Some said that they had learned to be more guarded about the acceptance and use of "packaged" materials. Others said they didn't realize there were so many roads to Rome.

12.4 What did you think about the opportunity you had to work with new approaches? — Most participants felt that they had good opportunity to learn about the approaches but needed more opportunity to work with the approaches.

Summary: Participants' Responses

General Objectives

Institutes should declare only one or two objectives many participants indicated, and should concentrate on the attainment of these objectives throughout. Participants should know clearly what the objectives are, should refer to the objectives constantly, and should help determine whether or not and to what degree the objectives are being attained.

Participants should be more clearly screened in terms of their personal objectives, or more arbitrarily selected in terms of the Institutes' declared objectives.

Participants were consistent and forceful in their recommendation that Institute objectives could have been realized to a better degree if children had been used for demonstration purposes and for practice-teaching opportunity. Participants also felt that objectives could have been realized more advantageously if they had been presented with facts and specifics about newer methods and then allowed to make their own judgments as to the merits of any one approach.

Size of Institute

A general feeling of staisfaction with Institute size was expressed. Even so, it was recommended that future Institutes be limited in size to between thirty and forty. Larger Institutes should be accomplished by definite scheduling of small "interest" groups so that sharing and learning could be enhanced.

Schedule

"Overscheduled" seems to best describe reactions of participants to Institutes. In the future, they suggested limiting Institutes to no more than six weeks in length. The Institute week should leave week-ends free and allow one or two afternoons during the week to be free. Institute days were too long. Social activities of a limited number are welcomed. Participants who commute or who bring families need to be given more thought when schedules are planned. Teachers are well known for being dedicated and hard working and this condition requires more careful thought be given to home work suggested and/or requested.

Administration

Administrators of Institutes met with good approval. Participants, if anything, were sympathetic about the busy schedules of administrators.

More administrative help should be available and participants should know about this before signing up for an Institute. Better working relationships between university authorities and Institute administrators was thought to be necessary in some instances.

Staff

Staff people should be qualified professional people who can demonstrate their methods as well as preach them. Book company people were criticized for promoting. Consultants should be able professional people who can demonstrate as well as theorize and who should have appropriate respect for the capabilities of the participants. Local reading or language arts specialists should be used to better advantage. It was felt that there would be little likelihood that staff members working with undergraduate preservice teachers would give the undergraduates enough of the Institute to make it unnecessary for them to attend a similar Institute at some future time.

Participants

Participants should know how and why they are selected to attend an Institute. Where possible, pre-Institute interviews should be planned. School authorities should have a better understanding of the advantages to their schools resulting from a teacher's participation in an Institute. Participants welcomed the opportunity to share ideas with teachers from different parts of the country when such arrangement was feasible.

Course Content

Course content should at least give as much time to practice as to theory. Practice should be accomplished with children by demonstration and by student-teaching opportunity. Integrating course content when an inter-disciplinary approach is possible is good. If anything, instructors should make better use of newer media of presentation.

Practicums

Practicums met with wide and high level endorsement. They should be carefully scheduled and supervised. Practicums should permit participants to work with children.

Tests

Participants were pleased to know more about informal testing procedures and would have liked to know more about standardized tests and the purposes they serve. Participants voiced concern about tests used by Institutes to determine grades for Institute participants.

Follow-up

They were almost unanimous in agreeing that no Institute should be approved unless it provides for some kind of follow-up. Kinds of follow-up recommended were: visits by Director and/or staff; a mid-winter reunion; an advanced Institute and so on.

More effort should be made through the Institute to assure local cooperation and appreciation and sharing. Credit should be a must because it results in salary increments and sometimes can be used toward a degree program.

Resources

Materials and aids are an important part of an Institute and should be provided, said the participants. However, more time should be scheduled for the study of materials. The materials should be separately housed so that this study can be done more effectively. Materials should be better organized and especially so early in the Institute.

New Approaches

New approaches might better be dealt with as different approaches. To many participants approaches available for many years were considered new, and for them, this classification was correct. Different approaches should be presented in such a way that participants can make a judgement about their corporative merits.

GENERAL REACTIONS OF REGIONAL DIRECTORS

In addition to the checklists for participants, administrators and staff, each visit to an NDEA Reading Institute was summarized in an essay by the Regional Directors. These summaries took several forms, for they were not structured in advance. Some were based primarily on facts reported in the checklists; others represented a combination of personal impressions and the use of checklist data; some represented largely the team leaders' personal reactions to what had been observed. Even though the essay statements varied, certain threads could be identified, and it is these threads which are reported in this section.

Directors and Staff The fact that Directors were not permitted to teach was questioned. Their energies, even though they were considered specialists in reading, were too often dissipated in administrative details which could have been cared for by an administrative assistant. Comments about the staff indicated that the Regional Directors thought they were highly regarded by the students. The desirability of pre-Institute planning sessions, to coordinate the efforts of all staff members, was mentioned often, as was the need for carefully integrating the contributions of visiting lecturers in total Institute plans.

The need for a smoother working relationship with the college or university administration for purchasing, and the provision of facilities, was questioned in a few reports. Better cooperation apparently would have made a difference.

Participants Observations about the participants fell into three categories: those relating to the range of levels or competencies, those dealing with selection, and those concerned with the follow-up of students after the closing of the Institute. There was general agreement on the part of the Regional Directors in certain observations, which follow:

The geographical areas from which participants were drawn varied among the Institutes. So did their teaching level and their experience background. The consensus among the evaluation teams was that variability should be encouraged only where the purposes of the Institute are best accomplished by this means.

Doubt was expressed, as to whether or not the participants were sufficiently capable people to provide leadership in their home schools either by demonstration of skills learned or by informal discussion. If Institute participants are expected to be potential influences of instructional practice in school systems, the selection criteria might well be re-examined.

Institute ideas could reach a larger population this way.

Proposals for the follow-up of Institute personnel were made in three ways:

First: Institute Directors could write letters to local school administrators about the individual participation in the Institute. Appropriate press releases could be suggested.

Second: Institute Directors could provide professional consultation service during the school year either by personal visits, by conferences or by mail.

Third: A "reunion" type meeting of all Institute participants sometime during the year.

Institute Directors had generally indicated that they had planned to use one or more of these follow-up activities and the Regional Directors endorsed the proposals.

Content The content of the Institutes elicited certain common comments. Although one of the principal purposes of the Institutes was to expose teachers to "new materials", what constituted "new materials" seemed to be a source of confusion. Since most of the participants in the different Institutes had a limited background in reading, anything they had not used in their classrooms was considered new. Regional Directors thought that the purposes of the Institute should determine what "new materials" are to be presented and whether or not they merit the label in the eyes of the participants.

Most library and materials facilities of the differenct Institutes were excellent; some though were inadequate. Interestingly, some facilities which were termed "inadequate" by some Institute Directors were far superior to those considered "adequate" by others. Again, the purposes of the Institute and the background of the participants and staff should determine the adequacy of the library and materials facilities.

In many of the reports regional evaluators reflected the opinions heard that Institutes would have been more effective if children had been used. In those Institutes in which observing and teaching children was a part of the program, a marked difference was observed.

In some instances evaluators felt that regular university courses had been grouped and offered as an Institute. Perhaps these violations of the intent of the law were the haste in preparing proposals, inexperience, and a remnant of the course-organization philosophy of our colleges and universities.

Summary The variability of content, form and emphases of the Institutes, even within a limited geographic area, was commented upon in many reports. So also was the high morale of the participants and staff. In general, the reactions of the team leaders were positive and complimentary of the efforts being expended by all concerned with the 1965 NDEA Reading Institutes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The reactions obtained from the Institute Directors, the staffs, the participants, and the subjective essay-type appraisals made by the regional leaders of the eight evaluation teams appear in this section. The conclusions, stated in digest form, are prepared to serve as recommendations for future Institutes. The conclusions are grouped under the general categories established for the check-list inquiries.

General Objectives

* Institutes should declare only a few primary objectives and concentrate on those in depth.

* Participants should be carefully selected in terms of the primary objectives of an Institute, should be expected to know the objectives, and should be asked to appraise and reappraise the objectives throughout the Institute program.

* The general objective — to improve the qualifications of individuals to teach — can be achieved better if children are made available for demonstration purposes and for practice-teaching opportunity at an Institute.

* If an Institute objective is planned to enlarge on a particular method or theory, adequate provision should be made to present other methods and theories so as to permit participants to compare and to judge.

* Adequate provision should be made to present different new materials and to evaluate the materials so that participants may compare and judge their worth.

* Institute objectives should either permit concentration on a narrower range of grade levels (i.e. primary) or foster planning that will permit adequate concentration at two levels (i.e. primary and intermediate).

Organization and Administration

* Institutes limited to about forty participants is thought to be most manageable, unless specific provision for staff and facilities is made.

* A six-week Institute appears optimal in most instances. Specific circumstances may warrant longer sessions.

* Daily schedules should permit participants adequate time for reflection, for individual research, and for sharing.

* A five-day week should be sufficient. Activities of a social nature should be scheduled meaningfully, with some occurring during the Institute day and some evenings.

* Administrative Assistants should be provided to enable Institute Directors, who should be reading specialists, to teach.

* Directors should be assured of full cooperation by university authorities.

* Directors' schedules should be adjusted during the semester preceding the Institute to permit time for adequate preparation for the Institute.

* Secretarial help should be provided before, during, and after an Institute.

* Staff members should be qualified people who can demonstrate as well as lecture.

* Staff members should be selected by the Institute Director aided by university authorities.

* Specialists living in the immediate area should be used when appropriate.

* Consultants should be especially well qualified, and great effort should be made to integrate their contributions with the total Institute program.

* Pre-Institute staff meetings for planning purposes should be held.

* Applicants, once selected to participate in an Institute, should be told why they were chosen in order that they may understand the responsibilities they are assuming.

* Where feasible, local school authorities should be encouraged to help select participants from their schools.

* When possible, participants should be selected who show potential leadership, so that Institute learnings may be shared and have wider influence on classroom practice.

* Participants should be selected so that some form of post-Institute follow-up may be accomplished.

Programs and Practices

* Materials should be adequate and current, but not over-whelming in number.

* Sufficient time should be scheduled during an Institute day to permit participants to examine and use materials.

* Special facilities for housing materials should be provided.

* Course content should give at least as much time to practice as to theory.

* Integrating course content on an interdisciplinary approach should be done whenever possible.

* Independent study time and individualizing of instruction should be provided.

* Children should be used to demonstrate ideas taught and to permit participants to try out ideas on a practice teaching basis whenever feasible.

* If materials are to be constructed by participants, special effort should be made to be certain that what is done is of practical value.

* Practicums and small group sharing sessions should be planned.

* How to measure achievement by means of standardized tests, informal tests, and teacher judgment should be an integral part of each Institute program.

* Pre- and post-test measures to assess change should be understood by participants so that results of their classroom teaching may be gauged.

* Tests and measurements used to grade participants should be of a high calibre, and should be carefully planned and used.

* Participants should know how and why they are being tested.

* Classroom facilities should permit the best of instructional opportunity.

* Library facilities should be adequate and readily available.

* Materials should be housed in an area where they can be examined and used without interfering with a class or the library.

* Housing and board for participants should be of the best available.

* Materials should be purchased early and made available from the beginning of an Institute so that they can be used most effectively.

Follow-up

* Each Institute should provide for some kind of follow-up.

* Funds should be requested in Institute proposals to provide for one or another kind of follow-up.

Appendix A

Members of Visiting Teams
Evaluation of
National Education Act
Institutes for Advanced Study
in Reading, 1965

John Ames, Queens College, Flushing, New York

Thomas Barrett, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Millard Black, Los Angeles Public Schools, California

James L. Butler, Chadron, Nebraska

Byron Callaway, University of Georgia, Athens

Alma Carl, University of Kentucky, Louisville

Sister Colleen, SSND, New Orleans, Louisiana

Clare M. Corcoran, Winchester Public Schools, Mass.

Emerald Dechant, Fort Hays College, Hays, Kansas

Harold Delavan, Mountain View Public Schools, Calif.

Thomas Devine, Rhode Island College, Providence

Robert Dykstra, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Jean C. Ervin, Arlington Public Schools, Virginia

Louis A. Fitzgerald, Pittsburgh Public Schools, Penna.

Mabel A. Gulick, Kansas School for the Deaf, Olathe, Kansas

Carl S. Gustafson, Laramie Public Schools, Wyoming

Mrs. Lyle Gray, Baltimore, Maryland

Helen Harson, Warwick Public Schools, Rhode Island

Clement Hasenfus, Rhode Island College, Providence

Ova M. Henderson, Charlottesville Schools, Virginia

Jack A. Holmes, University of California, Berkeley

Thomas D. Horn, University of Texas, Austin

Edna M. Horrocks, Cleveland Public Schools, Ohio

Edward G. Hunt, Warwick Public Schools, Rhode Island

Kellogg W. Hunt, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Oscar T. Jarvis, University of Georgia, Athens

Albert J. Kingston, University of Georgia, Athens

Eleanor M. Ladd, Pinellas County Schools, Florida

Helene Lloyd, New York City Public Schools, New York

George E. Mason, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Everett V. Maxwell, Rhode Island State Dept. of Educ.
Providence

Newton Metfessel, University of Southern California,
Los Angeles

Virgil W. Nestrick, City University of New York, N.Y.

Marion L. Nolan, University of Kansas, Lawrence

Elizabeth H. Ott, University of Texas, Austin

Raymond Picozzi, Rhode Island College, Providence

Amelia Roberts, South Carolina State College,
Orangeburg, South Carolina

Eleanor F. Roberts, Richmond, Virginia

Earleen Rogers, Greenville Public Schools, Miss.

Helen E. Schaper, Portland Public Schools, Oregon

John S. Simmons, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Robert Stepp,University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Donald Stern, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Helda L. Stocker, Cuyahoga County Schools, Ohio

Dianna Umstattd, Saginaw Public Schools, Michigan

Richard C. Wilson, The Florida State University, Tallahassee

Nita Wyatt, University of Kansas, Lawrence

Appendix B

National Defense Education Act

Institutes for Advanced Study

in Reading, 1965

* Institutes visited by evaluation teams

Alabama

Auburn University, Auburn. Remedial Reading. 40 teachers (grades 1-9). July 16-August 26. Arthur Coss, Director. (2)

California

Sacramento State College, Sacramento. General Reading. 50 teachers (grades K-6). June 21-July 30. Walter T. Petty, Director. (3)

* San Jose State College, San Jose. General Reading. 36 teachers (grades 1-6). June 21-July 30. Robert Bainbridge, Director. (3)

Colorado

Colorado State College, Greeley. General Reading. 75 teachers (grades 1-6). June 21-August 13. Glen S. Gagon, Director. (3)

Connecticut

* University of Hartford, West Hartford. Reading for Disadvantaged Youth. 50 teachers (grades 7-12). June 20-August 6. James E. Bullock, Director. (2,3)

Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven. Organization and Operation of Reading Centers. 30 teachers (grades 2-12). June 28-August 6. Mildred H. Huebner, Director. (1,2)

District of Columbia

* Gallaudet College. Reading for the Deaf Child. 20 teachers (grades K-12). July 5-August 13. Sara Withers, Director. (2,3)

Howard University. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades K-6). June 21-July 30. Eunice Shaed Newton, Director. (3)

Florida

University of Florida, Gainesville. Remedial Reading. 30 teachers (grades 4-6). June 21-August 13. George D. Spache, Director. (2,3)

* Florida Presbyterian College, St. Petersburg. Reading for Culturally Different Youth. 45 teachers (grades 7-12). June 21-July 31. William G. Thomson, Director. (2,3)

Georgia

University of Georgia, Athens. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades K-8). June 14-August 14. Ira E. Aaron, Director. (3)

Illinois

Concordia Teachers College, River Forest. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades K-6). June 21-July 30. R.L. Reinke, Director. (3)

Indiana

Indiana University, Bloomington. General Reading. 36 teachers (grades 1-12). June 21-August 13. Edward G. Summers, Director. (3)

Valparaiso University, Valparaiso. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades 4-9). June 21-August 6. Richard G. Kroenke, Director. (3)

Kansas

* University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City. Reading for the Hearing-Impaired Child. 30 teachers (grades K-6). June 14-July 23. June B. Miller, Director. (3)

Kentucky

* Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades K-6). June 14-August 6. Mable Jennings, Director. (3)

University of Kentucky, Lexington. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades 7-12). June 11-August 6. Wallace Ramsey, Director. (3)

Louisiana

* Xavier University of New Orleans, New Orleans. General Reading. 35 teachers (grades 1-8). June 14-July 23. Sister Clare Mary, Director. (3)

Maryland

* Morgan State College, Baltimore. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades 7-12). June 21-August 2. Maurice A. Lee, Director. (3)

Massachusetts

* Boston University, Boston. Supervision of Reading Instruction. 60 supervisors (grades 1-6). July 12-August 20. Richard Chambers, Director. (1)

Tufts University, Medford. General Reading. 25 teachers (grades 1-11). June 29-August 7. M. Virginia Biggy, Director. (3)

Michigan

* Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant. Developmental and Remedial Reading. 30 teachers (grades 7-12). June 21-August 13. A. Riley Gaskill, Director. (2,3)

Wayne State University, Detroit. General Reading. 35 teachers (grades K-8). June 28-August 6. Jean F. Hamilton, Director. (3)

Mississippi

* University of Mississippi, University. Linguistics in Reading Instruction. 20 teachers (grades 1-6). June 7-July 30. John F. Rogers, Director. (2)

University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades 1-6). June 14-August 6. Eric L. Thurston, Director. (2,3)

Nebraska

* Chadron State College, Chadron. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades K-6). June 14-August 6. James J. Wilson, Director. (3)

New York

* City University of New York, Hunter College, New York. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades K-9). July 1-August 12. Lawrence Gold, Director. (3)

* Manhattan College, Riverdale. General Reading. 35 teachers (grades 1-6). June 28-August 13. Austin M. Flynn, F.S.C., Director. (3)

Syracuse University, Syracuse. Remedial Reading. 50 teachers (grades 4-9). June 28-August 6. Margaret Early and W.D. Sheldon. (2)

Ohio

* Kent State University, Kent. General Reading. 75 teachers (grades 4-9). June 14-July 23. James A. Phillips, Jr., Director. (3)

* Western Reserve University, Cleveland. General Reading. 80 teachers (grades K-9). June 21-July 30. Lawrence M. Kasdon, Director. (2,3)

Oklahoma

Oklahoma State University, Stillwater. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades K-9). June 7-August 7. Bernard R. Belden, Director. (3)

Oregon

* Portland State College, Portland. Reading for Disadvantaged Youth. 54 Portland teachers (grades 1-6). July 27-August 13. Keith Larson, Dir. (3)

Pennsylvania

* Chatham College, Pittsburgh. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades K-6). June 28-August 6. Margaret Keyser Hill, Director. (3)

* Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh. General Reading. 35 teachers (grades 1-6). June 28-August 6. Sister Mary Paul Hickey, Director. (3)

* University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades 7-12). June 21-August 6. Donald L. Cleland, Director. (3)

Puerto Rico

* University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades 1-6). June 2-July 30. Sylvia Viera, Director. (3)

Rhode Island

* University of Rhode Island, Kingston. General Reading. 50 teachers (grades 7-12). June 28-August 20. Robert C. Aukerman, Director. (3)

* Rhode Island College, Providence. Supervision of Reading Instruction. 25 teachers and principals (grades K-6). June 28-August 6. Coleman Morrison, Director. (3)

South Carolina

* Claflin University, Orangeburg. General Reading. 50 teachers (grades 1-6). June 7-July 16. Alethia S. Worthy, Director. (3)

South Dakota

* University of South Dakota, Vermillion. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades 4-8). June 14-August 6. Cecil Kipling, Jr., Director. (3)

Tennessee

George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades 4-8). June 21-August 13. Richard H. Hinze, Director. (3)

University of Tennessee, Knoxville. General Reading. 25 teachers (grades K-12). July 19-August 28. William C. Davies, Director. (3)

Texas

* Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades 1-8). July 19-August 27. Thomas T. Salter, Director. (3)

* Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches. General Reading. 45 teachers (grades 1-6). July 19-August 27. Genora McFaddin, Director. (3)

* Texas Western College, El Paso. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades K-6). June 7-July 31. Marion Cline, Jr., Director. (3)

Virginia

* University of Virginia, Charlottesville. General Reading. 35 teachers (grades 1-9). July 5-August 13. Emery P. Bliesmer, Director. (3)

* Virginia State College, Petersburg. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades 1-6). June 21-August 13. Goldie F. Nicholas, Director. (3)

* Virginia Union University, Richmond. General Reading. 30 teachers (grades K-6). June 21-July 31. Dorothy N. Cowling, Director. (3)

West Virginia

West Virginia University, Morgantown. General Reading. 60 teachers (grades K-3). June 14-August 21. Eddie C. Kennedy, Director. (3)

Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. Remedial Reading. 30 teachers (grades 1-9). June 21-August 13. Arthur W. Schoeller, Director. (2)

* Wisconsin State University, Platteville. General Reading. 40 teachers (grades 1-6). June 14-August 6. Elisa Ann Neal, Director. (3)

Wyoming

* University of Wyoming, Laramie. General Reading. 24 teachers (grades K-6). June 7-July 30. Roberta Starkey, Director. (2)